

REMARKS

This is in response to the final Office Action mailed July 3, 2008. Claims 14, 27 and 28 are amended. Support for the amendments is found, for example, in paragraphs [38] and [41] of the application. Claims 14-40 remain pending. Reconsideration and allowance are requested for the following reasons.

Claim Rejections

In section 4 of the Action, claims 14-18, 27, 28, and 30-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,171,443 (Tiemann et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,892,226 (Tso et al.). This rejection is respectfully traversed, and reconsideration is requested for at least the following reasons.

Claim 14 recites, in part:

- caching the component object in the output cache if the component object corresponds with a user control that supports output caching, the component object cached using a cache key that comprises an identifier that is unique for each occurrence of the component object; and
- inserting the retrieved component objects of the page object and the created component objects of the page object into a hierarchical tree data model at the first computing system, each component object being linked to a prior component object if a prior component object exists, and each component being linked to a next component object if a next component object exists.

Claim 14 therefore requires that component objects that support output caching are cached using a unique cache key for each component object. Claim 14 also requires that retrieved component objects are inserted into a hierarchical tree data model.

In Tiemann, dynamic elements are identified as elements of an HTML template file having a CACHE tag. Tiemann also discloses that an identifier may be used to indicate dynamic portions of the template. However, Tiemann does not disclose or suggest the use of cache key that is unique for each occurrence of a component object, as recited in claim 14 of the present application. Tiemann discloses that each CACHE tag used to identify dynamic elements in the

HTML template file is exactly the same and not unique. See col. 6, ll. 1-37 of Tiemann. In addition, there is no suggestion in Tiemann that the identifier that may be alternatively used in place of a CACHE tag would be unique for each occurrence of a component object.

Tiemann also does not disclose linking component objects in a hierarchical tree model. In Tiemann, static and dynamic objects are combined into an HTML file. Figure 5 of Tiemann shows that combined HTML file 550 is formed from static components from static HTML file 170 and from dynamic components from dynamic HTML file 160. As shown in Figure 5, the static and dynamic portions (311-314) are simply combined into HTML file 550. They are not shown as being linked together in a hierarchical tree module where a prior component object is linked to a next component object, as recited in claim 14 of the present application. In addition, the example HTML template file shown in column 6, lines 13-37 of Tiemann does not disclose that the dynamic and static elements are linked together.

Tso discloses a system and methods for presenting dynamic content to a user of a client device. Tso does not disclose or suggest inserting component objects in a linked hierarchical tree and does not otherwise remedy the deficiencies of Tiemann. Therefore, the combination of Tiemann and Tso does not disclose all the elements of claim 14. Furthermore, since claims 15-26 depend from claim 14, claims 15-18 are also allowable over the combination of Tiemann and Tso.

Claim 27, recites in part, assembling the static components and the dynamic components into a hierarchal data model at the server computing system, the static components and dynamic components being linked to each other in the hierarchical data model. As discussed above, neither Tiemann nor Tso, alone or in combination, discloses or suggests assembling static and dynamic components into a hierarchal data model at the server computing system and linking the static components and dynamic components to each other in the hierarchical data model as recited in claim 27 of the present application. Therefore, claim 27 is allowable over the combination of Tiemann and Tso.

Claim 28 recites, in part, inserting the generated page components into a hierarchical tree model at the server computing device, each page component being linked to a prior page

component if a prior page component exists, and each page component being linked to a next page component if a next page component exists. As discussed above, neither Tiemann nor Tso, alone or in combination, discloses or suggests inserting page components into a hierarchical tree model where the page components are linked together such that each page component linked to a prior page component if a prior page component exists, and each page component linked to a next page component if a next page component exists. Therefore, claim 28, as well as claims 30-34 that depend therefrom, is allowable over the combination of Tiemann and Tso.

In section 17 of the Action, claims 19-22, 29, and 35-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,171,443 (Tiemann et al.) and U.S. Patent No. 6,892,226 (Tso et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,249,844 (Schloss et al.). This rejection is respectfully traversed, and reconsideration is requested for at least the following reasons.

As discussed above, claims 14 and 28 are allowable over the combination of Tiemann and Tso. Schloss discloses a method for identifying, processing and caching object fragments in a web environment. Schloss does not remedy the deficiencies of Tiemann and Tso. Since claims 19-22 depend from claim 14 and claims 29 and 35-37 depend from claim 28, claims 19-22, 29 and 35-37 are allowable over the combination of Tiemann, Tso, and Schloss.

In section 26 of the Action, claims 23, 24, 26, 38 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,171,443 (Tiemann et al.), U.S. Patent No. 6,892,226 (Tso et al.) and U.S. Patent No. 6,249,844 (Schloss et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,434,992 (Mattson). This rejection is respectfully traversed, and reconsideration is requested for at least the following reasons.

As discussed above, claims 14 and 28 are allowable over the combination of Tiemann and Tso. Matson discloses a method, apparatus and computer product for identifying, processing and caching object fragments in a web environment. Matson does not remedy the deficiencies of Tiemann, Tso, and Schloss. Since claims 23, 24 and 26 depend from claim 14 and claims 38 and 39 depend from claim 28, claims 23, 24, 26, 38 and 39 are allowable over the combination of Tiemann, Tso, Schloss and Matson.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, favorable reconsideration in the form of a Notice of Allowance is requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if a telephone conference would advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(612) 332-5300

Date: July 3, 2008

/Robert A. Kalinsky/
Name: Robert A. Kalinsky
Reg. No.: 50,471